



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,025	02/23/2006	Nisa M. Arnold-Huyser	026032-4899	8239
22428 7590 06/25/2009 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
EXAMINER				
BROADHEAD, BRIAN J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3664				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/25/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/532,025

Applicant(s)

ARNOLD-HUYSER ET AL.

Examiner

BRIAN J. BROADHEAD

Art Unit

3664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1, 3, 8-13, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshida et al., 6434482, in view of Levine, 2001/0032880.
2. Oshida et al. disclose a GPS receiver on line 23, column 4; a database including road network and POI information on lines 24-25, on column 4; a microprocessor coupled to the GPS and to the database for providing display output signals representing highway exits in the vicinity of the current vehicle location on line 31, on column 4, and lines 1-4, on column 5; and a display for selectively displaying the exits on a highway on which the vehicle is traveling, wherein the microprocessor is

programmed to respond to the operator input signals to provide a scroll-forward display of upcoming highway exits and for displaying POI accessible at such highway exits on lines 2-4, on column 5; the POI information includes several categories in Figure 3; each establishment is identified by name and address on line 32, on column 8; the microprocessor responds to operator input signals to provide a scroll-backward display of passed highway exits and POI accessible at such highway exits on line 28, on column 4; only POIs within a predetermined range are displayed on the range is less than about four miles on lines 13-14, on column 6; the operator actuated switch allows the operator to select POIs and display distance, direction, and detailed information to the POI on lines 5-27, on column 5; updating the road network and POI information separately on lines 43-49, on column 6; and including a compass coupled to the display on line 20, on column 4. Oshida et al. does not disclose an operator actuated switch for switching between display modes. Levine teaches an operator actuated switch for switching between display modes in paragraphs 27 and 28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the switch of Levine in the invention of Oshida et al. because such modification would allow the user access to the information that is required as stated in Levine.

3. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshida et al., 6434482, in view of Levine, 2001/0032880, as applied to the claims above in further view of Murphy, 5991690.

4. Oshida et al. and Levine disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose the operator selecting addresses on the current street which the vehicle is

traveling or cross streets ahead and behind the vehicle; the display of cross streets includes graphic lines depicting the sides of a roadway and the cross street are positioned between the lines; the display of cross streets includes at least one arrow(or vehicle position marker) aligned with respect to the displayed cross streets at a position indicating the position of the vehicle with respect to the cross streets; and displaying two cross streets ahead of the vehicle. Murphy teaches the operator selecting addresses on the current street which the vehicle is traveling or cross streets ahead and behind the vehicle; the display of cross streets includes graphic lines depicting the sides of a roadway and the cross street are positioned between the lines; the display of cross streets includes at least one arrow(or vehicle position marker) aligned with respect to the displayed cross streets at a position indicating the position of the vehicle with respect to the cross streets; and displaying two cross streets ahead of the vehicle in figure 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the teachings of Murphy in the invention of Oshida et al. because such modification would provide an improved navigation system with a simplified display as stated by Murphy.

5. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshida et al., 6434482 in view of Levine, 2001/0032880, as applied to the claims above in further view of Kubota et al., 6351698.

6. Oshida et al. and Levine disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose including an outside temperature sensor coupled to the display or the display includes a trip computer. Kubota et al. teach using a temperature sensor hooked up to the display and a trip computer on lines 23 and 32, on column 5. It would have been

Art Unit: 3664

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the sensor and trip computer of Kubota et al. in the invention of Oshida et al. because such modification would an interactive vehicle control system that achieves good communication with a driver as stated in Kubota et al.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN J. BROADHEAD whose telephone number is (571)272-6957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday or Tuesday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on 571-272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian J. Broadhead/
Examiner, Art Unit 3664